



# Ballot measures

## Proposition No. 1

### CLARK COUNTY PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION BENEFIT AREA AUTHORITY (C-TRAN)

The Clark County Public Transportation Benefit Area Authority adopted Resolution #BR-04-002 concerning a proposition to increase the sales and use tax. The proposition would increase the sales and use tax within the district by an amount not-to-exceed 0.3 percent for the purpose of maintaining and enhancing public transit services.

Should this proposition be:

APPROVED ... ☐

REJECTED .... ☐

#### Statement for:

Since 1981, C-TRAN has provided transportation to the people of Clark County. C-TRAN also provides door-to-door C-VAN service for people with severe disabilities. In 2003, C-TRAN provided 6.91 million trips for its riders. From the beginning, C-TRAN has received 3 cents of the sales tax on every \$10.00 spent in Clark County. C-TRAN carefully managed these tax dollars in its reserve fund, never having to borrow money for capital improvements such as new buses and Park & Rides.

With the passage of Initiative 695 in 1999, C-TRAN lost 40% of its operating revenue when vehicle excise taxes were eliminated. C-TRAN responded by raising fares twice, increasing ridership by 12%, selling advertising space and diverting reserves designated for capital projects to subsidize services. It was not enough. Reserve funds have steadily dwindled and will be reaching minimum levels by 2005, according to current projections.

Our community is faced with a choice of how C-TRAN will balance its budget and continue operating: Cut services by 46% beginning January 2005, or voters must approve Proposition #1, a request for an additional 3¢ in sales tax per \$10.00 purchase. This combined revenue, which would total six tenths of a penny in taxes per dollar spent, would enable C-TRAN to maintain and expand upon current services to fulfill its critical mission of service to Clark County. Please vote *yes* and support our vital transit system.

For more information, go to [www.c-tranroadmap.com](http://www.c-tranroadmap.com) or call C-TRAN at 695-0123 and request a copy of the Fact Piece.

Written by: David Cooper, Chair, Proponent Committee, PO Box 2608, Vancouver 98668, (360) 254-1562; Mike Worthy, 1518 NW 79th Circle, Vancouver 98665, (360) 993-2265; John Idsinga, 109 SW 1st Street, 2nd floor, Battle Ground 98604, (360) 342-5000.

Contact: (360) 608-7996; [www.yes4c-tran.com](http://www.yes4c-tran.com); [yesforc-tran@arcofclarkcounty.org](mailto:yesforc-tran@arcofclarkcounty.org).

#### Rebuttal of statement against:

The Facts: Available reserves will dwindle to \$1.7 million by 12/2005; 96% of trips cost \$2.96; no C-TRAN funds were expended on HOV lanes; and opponents overstate projected surpluses by 460%.

In 2000, service was significantly reduced, 78 jobs eliminated, fares were raised. No funds have been spent on light rail in nearly a decade. This would be the first tax increase ever for C-TRAN.

For the truth call (360)608-7996 or go to [www.yes4c-tran.com](http://www.yes4c-tran.com)

Written by: David Cooper, Chair;  
Mike Worthy; John Idsinga

---

**C-TRAN explanatory statement:**

In 1980, voters within the C-TRAN boundaries approved a 0.3% sales and use tax levy. These funds were previously matched by an equal amount of motor vehicle excise tax (MVET) which was repealed by voters in 1999. Tax revenues pay a portion of the costs of providing transit services. Passage of the ballot measure would increase the sales and use taxes by an additional amount not-to-exceed 0.3% (an additional 3¢ on every taxable \$10 purchase). Increased tax revenues would enable C-TRAN to balance its budget, improve existing service, and provide service to smaller cities and adjacent areas.

---

**Statement against:**

Should taxpayers put more taxes into C-Tran's \$70,000,000 retained earnings account? Taxpayers pay about \$22 for each passenger ride. *Federal* taxes pay about 90% of new buses and transit centers' building costs.

I-695 reduced exorbitant licensing fees; C-Tran cried "foul" while holding \$96,000,000 in retained earning reserves. Each of Washington's 25 transit agencies holds a surplus account. This totals hundreds of millions of taxpayer dollars held hostage while asking taxpayers for more and more taxes.

C-Tran continually threatens layoffs/service cuts; having to "scrape" up dollars; misleads taxpayers about its "scant" surplus/earnings.

Increasing sales tax from .3% to .6% doubles C-TRAN's income and will provide C-Tran with a yearly \$8,000,000 surplus.

Added to each \$1.00 you spend on goods and services your sales tax will be: La Center 8.2¢, Battle Ground 8.2¢, Ridgefield 8.2¢, Vancouver 8¢, Camas 8¢, Washougal 7.8¢, Unincorporated 8.1¢.

C-Tran's planning wastes millions of tax dollars building, dismantling and/or relocating transit centers.

C-Tran contributed \$3,000,000 out of the \$65,000,000 cost for I-5 HOV lanes. Now Clark County Commissioners can ask taxpayers to raise car license fees for additional tax dollars; possibly paving the way for light rail.

C-Tran paid over \$3,000,000 for light rail studies. Portland owns the MAX gravity train. Washington taxpayers will pay a percentage of Tri-Met's total transit costs even if only one inch of light rail crosses the river; more Clark County taxation without representation!

C-Tran needs a "true cost" not a "what I want budget." Stop the Waste, vote "no."

Written by: Frances Rutherford, Chair - No on C-Tran's November 2004  
Tax Levy Committee (360) 896-2283; Jeanne Lipton (360) 737-3676,  
jlipton@pacifier.com; Larry Martin (360) 573-6298

---

**Rebuttal of statement for:**

Is there something wrong with this picture? In 2000 Vancouver Fire and Police yearly budgets were about \$17,000,000 each. In 2000 C-Tran's reserve was \$95,000,000; revenues were \$33,186,132. C-Tran doesn't have to borrow revenue for new buses or Park & Rides because federal grants pay 90% of these costs.

Passing this tax provides C-Tran with a surplus starting at \$8,000,000 per year and continues to grow perhaps surpassing the \$96,000,000 reserves it previously amassed.

Written by: Frances Rutherford,  
Chair; Jeanne Lipton; Larry Martin

---

## City of Vancouver

### PROPOSED CITY CHARTER AMENDMENT NO. 1

Shall City Charter Section 2.01 be amended to increase the term of mayor from two to four years?

YES ... ☐

NO ... ☐

---

#### Statement for:

After 40 years of voting for Vancouver's mayor every two years, it is time for voters to change the charter to give the city's chief political executive four years to do an increasingly complicated job.

The designers of the present system provided the chance for the voters to change the council's majority, direction and emphasis at every biennial municipal election. That opportunity for radical change has never been found necessary by anything close to a substantial minority of the voters. It is increasingly a potential liability rather than a theoretical asset.

Vancouver is a fast-paced, increasingly metropolitan city. As such it requires strong and steady leadership to continue its economic and social growth. In order for a good leader to set into motion, promote and then accomplish needed changes, that leader must have opportunity and the time to implement those changes.

Each of us votes for a candidate for mayor for different reasons, but for the most part we vote for the candidate we believe has a vision for a better, stronger, more vibrant Vancouver. We believe in their vision, their policies and their ability to accomplish their agenda.

It is time that we, as citizens of Vancouver, give our mayors the time to accomplish their goals, to do what we elect them to do.

We provide every other member of the City Council a four-year term of office so they will have a sufficient amount of time to accomplish their objectives. We should do the same for our Mayor.

Written by: David Michael Heywood, Scott Harris, Robert Stewart

---

#### Rebuttal of statement against:

*No rebuttal statement was submitted*

---

## PROPOSED CITY CHARTER ADMENDMENT NO. 1

**Resolution M-3462:** “A RESOLUTION and proposal to amend City Charter Section 2.01 to increase the term of mayor from two to four years.”

### **Explanatory Statement:**

**Current Law:** The term for mayor in the City of Vancouver is currently two (2) years, resulting in an election for mayor in every municipal general election (i.e. every odd numbered year).

**Results of passage:** The proposed amendment would increase the term of the mayor from two (2) years to four (4) years, commencing with the municipal general election in 2005. The election for mayor would take place every four (4) years after that.

### **Statement against:**

Vancouver’s mayoral term lasts for two years and is on the ballot in every odd-year election. The reasons for a two-year mayoral term are all centered on increasing the responsiveness of city government to the citizens of Vancouver. The Mayor is the most influential elected official both in policy making and administrative oversight. Providing the citizens the use of the ballot box to express endorsement or displeasure of someone’s leadership every two years keeps the Mayor more attuned to their constituents. The ballot is a safety valve that often prevents confrontational expressions of democracy such as recall efforts and citizen protests.

There are seven members of the Vancouver City Council: the Mayor and six at large Councilors. Three council seats are up for election every two years. With the mayor’s seat also up for election every two years, citizens have the opportunity to elect a new four person majority each municipal election. Again, this strengthens representative democracy by increasing elected officials responsiveness to the electorate.

Finally, a two year term is far from uncommon in electoral politics. Both federal and state representatives serve two year terms.

Written by: Matt Lewis, Gayle Rothrock

---

### **Rebuttal of statement for:**

*No rebuttal statement was submitted*

## City of Vancouver

### PROPOSED CITY CHARTER AMENDMENT NO. 2

Shall initiative and referendum provisions of Vancouver City Charter Title X be amended to prohibit petitions on subjects contrary to state law; provide for the form of petitions, approval of petitions as to form, circulators' affidavits to be under penalty of perjury, the county auditor to verify signatures, public readings and hearing on measures, and for thirty days to collect referendum signatures; and update outmoded references to "electors," "paper ballots" and "voting machines?"

YES ... ☐

NO ... ☐

#### Statement for:

The 1889 State Constitution authorizes Vancouver to establish its own Charter. In 1952 Vancouver approved a Charter including an Initiative & Referendum (I&R) provision. A 1986 amendment requires petitioners be registered voters. Our Charter I&R provision establishes a means for citizens to directly influence city policies. The Charter Review process allows citizens to look after Vancouver's future by evaluating our existing City Charter.

Lessons learned over the last few years displayed our existing Charter's I&R procedures are confusing to our citizens, and, they subject us to unnecessary administrative expense and increased litigation risk. These proposed changes make Vancouver's I&R process easier for citizens to understand, simplify the process for filing, and assure consistent staff administration. The changes will also reduce administrative costs, lower litigation risk and ensure the credibility of our Charter I&R process.

Vancouver is a caring, proactive, energetic community that progresses through insight, action, and change. Your Charter Review Committee is asking citizens to step into this new century by updating the Charter I&R provision for the benefit of the entire community.

A *yes* vote will ensure that:

1. The I&R process is clear and understandable to citizens;
2. The city will administer the process consistently;
3. Administrative costs will be reduced;
4. Risk and potential for litigation will be lowered;
5. The provision remains consistent with its intent and the growing needs of

Vancouver.

Join your Charter Review Committee—made up of citizens like you—in its recommendation to City Council for improving this important Charter provision!

Mark Maggiora: Pro Statement Committee Chair, 992-9969, Fax: 992-5880,  
mark@grouppnw.net; Norwood Brown: 750-0475, norwoodart@integrity.com;  
VaNessa Duplessie, 750-7302, balancedjw@earthlink.net  
Current City Charter: [www.ci.vancouver.wa.us/charter/charter.htm](http://www.ci.vancouver.wa.us/charter/charter.htm)  
Charter Review Committee Minutes: [http://www.ci.vancouver.wa.us/](http://www.ci.vancouver.wa.us/CharterReview/default.asp)  
CharterReview/default.asp

#### Rebuttal of statement against:

These proposed Charter changes received full and careful consideration by a citizen committee. Only after Council assessment and affirmation were they referred to voters.

Resolving problematic language with the I&R process was not taken lightly. Requiring an Affidavit is prudent considering petition signing abuses that can occur. This amendment assures good governance far beyond "housekeeping."

Vancouver deserves assurance that citizen generated Initiatives and Referendums are subject to the highest level of integrity and accountability.

Written by:

Mark Maggiora, Chair; Pro Statement Committee

## PROPOSED CITY CHARTER AMENDMENT NO. 2

### **Explanatory statement:**

Resolution M-3463: “A RESOLUTION and proposal to amend City Charter Sections 10.01, 10.02, 10.03, 10.04, 10.05, 10.06, 10.07, 10.08, 10.09, 10.10, and 10.11 to clarify the process for initiative and referendum.”

**Current law:** The Charter is silent on which subjects are ineligible for initiative and referendum under state law; does not provide for pre-circulation review of petitions; does not explicitly state circulator’s affidavits must be signed under penalty of perjury or that petitions go to city council for readings and hearing before action; is ambiguous on the time for circulating referendum petitions; contains outmoded references to the city clerk, not the county auditor, verifying petition signatures; and makes outmoded references to “electors,” “paper ballots” and “voting machines.”

**Result of passage:** The amendments would clarify these points and delete the outmoded references.

### **Statement against:**

Initiative and Referendum No. 2 proposed by the City Charter Committee is being billed as a “housekeeping” amendment to clarify multiple sections of the City Charter. Initiative and Referendum No. 2 will change wording in Section 10 of the City Charter from *electors to registered voters of the city* to clarify who is qualified to sign a petition. The resolution also attempts to align the City Charter with State law.

However, on closer inspection, it should be noted that changes to Sections 10.03 and 10.04 of the City Charter indicate that an affidavit “sworn or affirmed under penalty of perjury” will be required by the circulator of a petition. It will also invalidate any petition without such a sworn affidavit attached. While on the surface it may appear to be a “housekeeping” matter, it must be recognized that a “penalty of perjury” has been added that is not found in the current City Charter.

It is a matter of opinion as to whether the addition of a penalty not found previously in the charter sections is indeed “housekeeping” or constitutes a “change in the charter”. It is however, at best, misleading to voters to propose a “housekeeping” measure which does indeed change the process by adding a penalty not before contained.

By voting *no* on this proposed amendment you would send a message that the voters of Vancouver need to be fully and fairly informed of the true nature of a proposed amendment.

Written by: Paula M. Martin

### **Rebuttal of statement for:**

*No rebuttal statement was submitted*

**PROPOSITION NO. 1  
CITY OF RIDGEFIELD  
Proposition Authorizing Increase of Existing  
Property Tax Levies**

The City of Ridgefield adopted Resolution No. 271 concerning this proposition. The proposition would authorize the City of Ridgefield to set its regular property tax levy to an amount not to exceed \$1.60 per \$1,000 of assessed valuation. (This shall not be construed to authorize an excess levy and shall be subject to otherwise applicable statutory limits.)

Should this proposition be enacted into law?

YES ... ☐

NO ... ☐

**City of Ridgefield explanatory  
statement:**

The City of Ridgefield seeks voter approval as provided by the limitations set forth in RCW 84.55 to authorize the City to increase its regular property tax levy to an amount not to exceed \$1.60 per thousand dollars of assessed value of property in the City.

*No statement for or against was submitted*

**PROPOSITION NO. 1  
CLARK COUNTY FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT NO. 10  
Board of Fire Commissioners  
Proposition Authorizing Increase of Existing  
Property Tax Levies**

The Board of Fire Commissioners adopted Resolution No. 09-16-2004 concerning this proposition. The proposition will authorize the Board of Fire Commissioners of the District to set its regular property tax levy to an amount not to exceed \$1.10 per \$1,000.00 of assessed valuation. (This shall not be construed to authorize an excess levy and shall be subject to otherwise applicable statutory limits.)

Should this proposition be enacted into law?

YES ... ☐

NO ... ☐

**Fire Protection District No. 10  
explanatory statement:**

Clark County Fire Protection District No. 10 seeks voter approval as provided by the limitations set forth in RCW 84.55 to authorize the Board of Fire District Commissioners to increase its regular property tax levy to an amount not to exceed \$1.10 per thousand dollars of assessed value of property in the District.

**Statement for:**

Clark County Fire District 10 would like to ask the voters of the District to approve a Levy Lid Lift to \$1.10 per thousand dollars of assessed valuation. This is the first time since 1961 that we have gone to the voters to ask for an increase in property taxes. The number of emergency responses has tripled since 1993. We need to increase our revenues for several reasons. First, as a result of the approval of Initiative 747 in 2001, our revenues no longer keep pace with the growth in call volume and inflation. Second, several Engines are over 30 years old, and need to be replaced to improve reliability. Third, as our stations age they require more maintenance than our current budget allows, and improvements to provide a safe working environment.

We believe that we have demonstrated a very conservative approach to spending the money that the residents of our District have given us. We strive to make sure that we provide the best service possible for the dollars you invest. We thank you for your continued support.

Written by: Sam Arola, President, Gordon Brooks, Rick Johnson  
Amboy Volunteer Firefighters Association

*No statement against was submitted*